

TUESDAY JUNE 11

QUESTION ONE:

Question: What is place in work? How is it related to inner freedom?

Mr. Nyland: Why all of a sudden? As soon as the last word is out, there is your question. Maybe you would like to give a little room to someone else maybe to think. Now, what is your question?

Question: What is the idea of place in the work and how is it related to inner freedom?

Mr. Nyland: What do you mean by place?

Question: The reading raises this question of Ouspensky trying to find his place in the work.

Mr. Nyland: And how is it related to...

Question: For me, personally.

Mr. Nyland: How is it related to what? Inner freedom?

Question: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Have you a place in this work? you think? You know ~~enough~~ enough about work. You know what your attitude is towards it. It either appeals to you or it does not. You can use it and do ~~or~~ you cannot use it. You try to use it; it does not seem to work out ~~or~~ it does. Whatever it is you have regarding work as it is explained to you or as you read it and whatever your understanding is, regarding that ~~x~~ you have a certain position. You consider it worthwhile or not. You have reasons why you think it is worthwhile. For whichever reason you want to ~~try~~ to continue to try to understand more or to put to practise that what you know, that is your affair regarding that what you wish to do in your life.

If you, in that way, have a certain position regarding work, you have a place regarding work. That is, ^{you are} you might say, in work at a certain place or you are in your place regarding work for your, let's call it, benefit. This will give you experience which you will know for yourself what it is worth. If that experience includes, for you a

realization of more inner freedom, it answers your question. If it does not, you can still have hope that you might become more innerly free. And perhaps, because on that basis, you will continue to try to work,

It is an entirely personal question. And it is not a question anyone can answer for you. Your place is wherever you work. How you are, in such a place depends on your understanding of work on yourself. As a result of work on yourself, you may obtain inner freedom.

QUESTION THREE

Question: "Roles" are mentioned as being points of difference of people, as associations are. Can you assume then that "roles" are a part of false personality, something that is acquired?

Mr. Nyland: I do not know what you mean by false personality. I do not know how much you know about acquired characteristics of a person. I do not know what you mean by what a person is essentially. What ^{he} is ^{as} ~~his~~ type? What was he born with? And all these different questions would enter. What is really a person as he is born and what are the different influences at the moment of birth or at the moment of conception?

Naturally there are three different, definite influences: Father and mother biologically; the place where a person is born, you might say, astrologically; and also then, as soon as he starts to live and become influenced, there will be sociological conditions. So that a person, when he is finally grown up, has the three different indications of how he was influenced, as represented in whatever he is, *manifests*, thinks and feels; that is, whatever his personality is. (?)

Now he behaves in different ways, if you understand by roles that those are different forms of behavior. A role like a person playing

(?)
a role but this time in ordinary life fulfilling a role or a certain place regarding his environment, his relationships with family, his relationships professionally, relationships maybe sociologically, that is, a relationship where there is no direct ~~contact~~ contact with his audience.

(?)
But all of this naturally refers to ~~a~~ ^{the} particular role that a man ~~has~~ regarding his own conscience, whatever he has of that. And the whole purpose of work is to develop that particular relationship which is a private one. And it has to do with whatever is man regarding his own, what he calls, his God or influences of a higher nature or the Sun Absolute or His Endlessness or whatever terminology you will want to use.

Now, in regard ~~at~~ to that whatever his false personality is, probably you mean by that; that whatever his impression is of himself is not actually the truth. But, since he is effected by so many thing, influences from the ^{and} outside ~~mostly~~, the acquired characteristic which are, you might say, added ~~to~~ ^{the} whatever he started out with, which are called sociological influences, most of that has made his personality and ~~what~~ his ordinary behavior on ordinary life. Whatever he thinks of that for himself, whatever he believes he is, it is his personality. Sometimes it is the same as what is the appearance to the outside world, to his friends; and sometimes he has a different opinion of himself.

The whole purpose of work is to try to find out what I really am so that, if I could become objective regarding myself, that I will gradually uncover that what is not truthful, that what is not real and that what then would be left of me, as a statement I could make about myself, "I am this and I am that." That, by means of work, by means of trying to work on myself and trying to become objective, I will then gather information which is worthwhile for me. And then,

June 11, 1963

PAGE 4

whatever still appears ^{of} to me as my personality manifested, may become a little closer to the actual truth of actually existing as it is and manifesting as it is. (?)

But I continue to play certain roles. Only they will not be ~~dependant~~ directed from the point of my personality only. And they will not be dependant on the wishes of my body or even my feelings or my intellect. But there is a possibility after all, regarding work, that something in me develops which starts to govern and guide the behavior forms of myself and under which influence gradually, that what I now have as acquired characteristic and, perhaps even going further to what what is my essential nature, that that gradually comes under the guidance of something which is really the truth for me in my life but which belongs to a different kind of level. I do not know if this answers your question. I hope it does.

QUESTION FIVE:

Question: What is the difference between Mr. Ouspensky's ^{work} and Mr. Gurdjieff's work? It seems to me that Mr. Ouspensky seems to stress more struggle in life as more (?) while Mr. Gurdjieff's work more like the monk.

Mr. Nyland: It is a very difficult question to answer. We do not know what ~~was~~ went on in Mr. Ouspensky; neither do we know what went on in Mr. Gurdjieff regarding Mr. Ouspensky. The description of the totality of the book, regarding work, covers a certain number of years in which Mr. Ouspensky had close contact with Gurdjieff. There is a period in which ~~Mr.~~ Ouspensky could not, as he said in his own words, get along with certain activities in which Mr. Gurdjieff was then interested.

It may be a personal question of his part. And it may be something else about which we ^{really} do not know at all what went on.

The fact that Mr. Ousepnsky preferred or decided to start to have his groups in London, that was his own personal conscience. I would not judge at all, from that, that there is any difference.

There is a different phase. After all, Mr. Gurdjieff and Ouspensky were together, closely connected at least for four years. During that period, I am quite certain, there was absolutely no difference. And it is recorded by Mr. Ouspensky what actually was being said by Gurdjieff. That, after wards, Mr. Gurdjieff tries to emphasize certain forms of work on oneself by means of movements, dances, music - it simply means that it is a different facet also and different possibilities of work, how it can be expressed and, by means of which such activities ^{could} ~~can~~ lead also to a form of consciousness, reaching, you might call it, the harmonious development of man.

It has nothing to do ^{as such} with Mr. Ouspensky. That is, Mr. Ouspensky does not express any particular opinion about it. What he did himself was his own matter, his own business. Maybe he could not find himself in that kind of an activity.

But there are many of us, ~~that~~ when we come in contact with the ideas, that certain parts of the ideas can appeal and other parts do not appeal. And that does not mean that there is a contradiction. It simply means that certain parts have a form of life for me which, at the present time, I can take and digest. ^{And} It is quite possible that, after some time, there are different forms of work again which I can take and then digest which, in the beginning, I could not digest.

Take simple forms for instance: when there is a theoretical expose, Enneagram or Diagram of Everything Living or ordinary explanations more or less of a theoretical nature, the Hydrogens, positive and negative which have absolutely no appeal to a great many people; ^{and} where they say that it is much too intellectual for me. On the other hand, there are certain people who cannot be attracted

to movements. Some people perhaps could be effected by music.

And maybe it is fortunate if one can be effected by all three. But the whole problem, when one is effected by any one, come for each person: What can he do to reach, in relation to ~~thinks~~ that what he understands, his own equilibrium and his own harmony? So that whatever it is that one is in contact with, movements, music or an intellectual approach, always has to be translated, in each person thus effected, in a way that he become interested in work on himself.

And then this whole question of the difference between Mr. Ouspensky ~~and~~ or Gurdjieff which, as I say, does not exist, it is completely - it is complete nonsense. It does not make any difference whatsoever, provided one is interested in the ideas and the ideas become part of one, as it were, as if one eats them. It does not make any difference any more after that. And I am quite certain that Mr. Ouspensky had that idea ^{or} ~~relationship~~ relationship that the ideas, for him, became more of value than even the relationship towards Mr. Gurdjieff, at least as close a relationship as he used to have but then gave up.

For all of us it is a question of work. It is not a question of Ousepensky. It is not a question of Guedjieff even. It is a question: What is work for me? And, to what extent can I understand it, use it and, by means of that, grow, if I am interested in the possible development of ~~myself~~ myself?